

Serial No.: 10/821,676  
Amendment Dated: July 27, 2005  
In Response to Office Action dated April 13, 2005

**REMARKS**

Claim 31 initially has been rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the claimed invention. Additionally, claims 1 – 3, 7, 16 – 18, 22 and 31 have been rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being purportedly unpatentable over *Singleton* (3,489,326) in view of *Bardsley* (5,182,997). Claims 4 and 19 have been rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over *Singleton* as modified by *Bardsley* and in further in view of *Jarvis, et al.* (4,822,241). Still further, claims 5 has been rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Singleton* as modified by *Bardsley* and in further view of *Jarvis, et al.*, while claim 20 has been rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over *Singleton* as modified by *Bardsley*. Claims 6 and 21 have been rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Singleton* as modified by *Bardsley* and in further view of *Hackney, et al.* (2,954,865), while claims 32 and 33 have been rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over *Singleton* in view of *Hackney, et al.*, and claim 34 likewise has been rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over *Singleton* as modified by *Hackney, et al.*, and in further view of *Jarvis, et al.* Lastly, claims 35, 38 – 42 and 46 have been rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over *Singleton* in view of *Andrew, et al.* (3,831,874). The remaining claims 36, 37, and 43 – 45 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but are stated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 47 – 51 have been found to be allowable over the prior art of record.

Serial No.: 10/821,676  
Amendment Dated: July 27, 2005  
In Response to Office Action dated April 13, 2005

Applicant respectfully disagrees with and traverses the rejections of claims 1 – 35, 38 – 42, and 46. However, in the interests of expediting the prosecution of the present application, Applicant has now canceled claims 1 – 34, 36 and 43 without disclaimer or prejudice to Applicant's pursuing claims of the same or similar scope in any later continuation applications, and has now amended claims 35, 39 and 42 to incorporate the language of objected to claim 43 therein. It is therefore respectfully requested that the current rejection of claims 35, 38 – 42, and 46 be withdrawn.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that currently pending claims 35, 37 – 42, and 44 – 51 are allowable over the prior art of record. An early notice of allowance accordingly is solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments regarding the foregoing response, he is invited and urged to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



D. Scott Sudderth  
Reg. # 34,026  
James F. Vaughan  
Reg. # 31,889

Womble Carlyle Sandridge & Rice, PLLC  
P.O. Box 7037  
Atlanta, Georgia 30357-0037  
(404) 962-7527